Domination of the rectangular queen's graph

Sándor Bozóki
Institute for Computer Science and Control, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA SZTAKI);
Corvinus University of Budapest
bozoki.sandor@sztaki.mta.hu

Péter Gál
Nuance-Recognita Zrt., Budapest, Hungary
Peter.Gal@nuance.com

István Marosi
Nuance-Recognita Zrt., Budapest, Hungary
Istvan.Marosi@nuance.com

William D. Weakley
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne, USA
weakley@ipfw.edu

arXiv:1606.02060v1 [math.CO] 7 Jun 2016

Abstract

The queens graph $Q_{m\times n}$ has the squares of the $m \times n$ chessboard as its vertices; two squares are adjacent if they are both in the same row, column, or diagonal of the board. A set D of squares of $Q_{m\times n}$ is a *dominating set* for $Q_{m\times n}$ if every square of $Q_{m\times n}$ is either in D or adjacent to a square in D. The minimum size of a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$ is the *domination number*, denoted by $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$.

Values of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$, $4 \le m \le n \le 18$, are given here, in each case with a file of minimum dominating sets (often all of them, up to symmetry) in an online appendix. In these ranges for m and n, monotonicity fails once: $\gamma(Q_{8\times 11}) = 6 > 5 = \gamma(Q_{9\times 11}) = \gamma(Q_{10\times 11}) = \gamma(Q_{11\times 11})$.

Lower bounds on $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ are given. In particular, if $m \le n$ then $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \ge \min\{m, \lceil (m+n-2)/4 \rceil\}$.

Two types of dominating sets (0-covers and centrally strong sets) are developed; each type is shown to give good upper bounds of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ in several cases.

Three questions are posed: whether monotonicity of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ holds (other than from $(m,n) = (8,11)$ to $(9,11)$), whether $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = (m+n-2)/4$ occurs with $m \le n < 3m+2$ (other than for $(m,n) = (3,3)$ and $(11,11)$), and whether the lower bound given above can be improved.

1 Introduction

Let m and n be positive integers. We will identify the $m \times n$ chessboard with a rectangle in the Cartesian plane, having sides parallel to the coordinate axes. We place the board so that the center of every square has integer coordinates, and refer to each square by the coordinates (x,y) of its center. Unless otherwise noted, squares have edge length one, and the board is placed so that the lower left corner has center $(1, 1)$; sometimes it is more convenient to use larger squares or to place the board with its center at the origin of the coordinate system. By symmetry it suffices to consider the case $m \leq n$, which we will assume throughout: the board has at least as many columns as rows.

The square (x,y) is in *column* x and *row* y. Columns and rows will be referred to collectively as *orthogonals*. The *difference diagonal* (respectively *sum diagonal*) through square (x,y) is the set of all board squares with centers on the line of slope $+1$ (respectively -1) through the point (x,y). The value of $y - x$ is the same for each square (x,y) on a difference diagonal, and we will refer to the diagonal by this value. Similarly, the value of $y + x$ is the same for each square on a sum diagonal, and we associate this value to the diagonal. Orthogonals and diagonals are collectively referred to as *lines* of the board.

The queens graph $Q_{m\times n}$ has the squares of the $m \times n$ chessboard as its vertices; two squares are adjacent if they are both in some line of $Q_{m\times n}$. A set D of squares of $Q_{m\times n}$ is a *dominating set* for $Q_{m\times n}$ if every square of $Q_{m\times n}$ is either in D or adjacent to a square in D. The minimum size of a dominating set is the *domination number*, denoted by $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$. A set of squares is *independent* if no two squares in the set are adjacent.

Almost all previous work on queen domination has concerned square boards. The problem of finding values of $\gamma(Q_{n\times n})$ has interested mathematicians for over 150 years; the first published work is that of De Jaenisch [12] in 1862. In 1892, Rouse Ball [18] gave values up to $n = 8$.

The first published work on nonsquare boards of which we are aware is in Watkins [19]: the values $\gamma(Q_{5\times 12}) = 4$ and $\gamma(Q_{6\times 10}) = 4$ (see Problem 8.4 on p. 132 and Figure 8.19 on p. 137), found by D. C. Fisher.

Say that two minimum dominating sets of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ are *isometrically equivalent* (usually just *equivalent*) if there is an isometry of the $m \times n$ chessboard that carries one to the other. (When $1 < m < n$, the board has four isometries, including the identity; if $1 < m = n$ there are eight.)

We have computed $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ for rectangular chessboards with $4 \leq m \leq n \leq 18$. Results are given in Table 1; for most m and n we give a file of minimum dominating sets with one from every equivalence class, unless the number of equivalence classes is large. An online appendix at http://www.sztaki.mta.hu/%7Ebozoki/queens includes the computational results. For each set, we describe its symmetry and say whether it can be

obtained by one of the constructions in Section 3.

The computation was done with a backtracking algorithm. The backtrack condition minimizes the number of queens placed. If a solution is found with k queens, then the remaining search space is limited to at most $k-1$ queens. The algorithm places a single queen in a position covering the top left cell and does a recursive call to cover all remaining cells. Some heuristics are used also to find the first solution faster: the first queen is placed in the middle of the board (actually in the closest to middle position attacking the top left cell); other possible attacking positions are only tried later. Frequently this position is part of a minimal solution.

Once it is shown that there is no solution with $k-1$ queens, a search for other solutions with k queens is made.

$n \diagdown m$	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
4	*2*														
5	2	*3*													
6	3	3	*3*												
7	3	3	4	*4*											
8	3	4	4	5	*5*										
9	4	4	4	5	5	*5*									
10	4	4	4	5	5	5	*5*								
11	4	4	5	5	**6**	5	5	*5*							
12	4	4	5	5	6	6	6	6	*6*						
13	4	5	5	6	6	6	7	7	7	*7*					
14	4	5	6	6	6	6	7	7	8	8	*8*				
15	4	5	6	6	6	7	7	7	8	8	8	*9*			
16	4	5	6	6	7	7	7	8	8	8	9	9	*9*		
17	4	5	6	7	7	7	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	*9*	
18	4	5	6	7	7	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	*9*

Table 1. Values of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$, $4 \le m \le n \le 18$

Cockayne [5, Problem 1] introduced monotonicity

$$\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) \stackrel{?}{\le} \gamma(Q_{(n+1)\times(n+1)})$$

as an open problem.

A remarkable observation about $Q_{8\times 11}$: six queens (with bold typeface in Table 1) are necessary to dominate it, though five queens are sufficient (and necessary) to dominate each of $Q_{9\times 11}$, $Q_{10\times 11}$, $Q_{11\times 11}$. A possible explanation for this is given later. We note that five queens can cover all but one square of $Q_{8\times 11}$. One of the 8 arrangements is as follows:



Figure 1. Five queens dominate $Q_{8\times 11}$ except for one square (•)

We extend Cockayne's question to the rectangular case.

Question 1 *Column-wise monotonicity: Does* $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \le \gamma(Q_{m\times(n+1)})$ *hold for* $m \le n$*?*

Row-wise monotonicity: Does $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \le \gamma(Q_{(m+1)\times n})$ *hold for* $m \le n, (m,n) \ne (8,11)$*?*

We discuss one type of internal symmetry of minimum dominating sets that frequently occurs. A *foursome* is a set of four squares $(x+a, y+b)$, $(x-a, y-b)$, $(x-b, y+a)$, $(x+b, y-a)$, where either each of x, y, a, b is an integer or each is half an odd integer, and a and b are unequal and nonzero. The center of the foursome is the point (x, y), which need not be a square center. For examples, see the first minimum dominating sets given for $Q_{9\times 9}$ and $Q_{11\times 11}$, as well as Figure 1 above.

It is easy to see that if a foursome F is flipped across the horizontal line through its center, the result is another foursome F' that occupies the same lines as F. (The same F' is obtained if F is flipped across the vertical line through its center or either diagonal through its center.)

Thus if a dominating set D of $Q_{m\times n}$ contains F, we may replace F in D with F' and obtain a dominating set D' of the same size as D. Usually D and D' are not equivalent.

As an example, we analyze the minimum dominating sets of $Q_{11\times 17}$. Up to equivalence there are 131 solutions, shown in the file. Of these, 85 have no foursomes, 41 have exactly one foursome, four (#125, 69, 70, 62) have exactly two foursomes, and one (#76) has 3 foursomes.

We may define a relation on the set $\mathcal{S}(11,17)$ of minimum dominating sets of $Q_{11\times 17}$ by saying that two sets are related if either they are isometrically equivalent, or flipping a foursome of the first set yields a set isometrically equivalent to the second set. This relation is reflexive and symmetric, and its transitive closure gives a partition $\mathcal{P}(11,17)$ of $\mathcal{S}(11,17)$, which may also be regarded as a partition of the set of (isometric) equivalence classes, as we will do.

For example, solution #125 has two foursomes: one centered at $(12,6)$ with $(a,b) = (4,2)$, and one centered at $(9,7)$ with $(a,b) = (3,-1)$. Flipping the first gives solution #124. If instead we flip the second, we get the reflection of #125 across its vertical line of symmetry. This implies that one cell of the partition $\mathcal{P}(11,17)$ contains just the equivalence classes of 125 and 124, and we denote this cell by {125, 124}. It is then straightforward to see that $\mathcal{P}(11,17)$ has 85 cells with one member and 20 cells with two members: {8, 9}, {20, 24} {19, 23}, {21, 25}, {22, 26}, {15, 27}, {13, 6}, {12, 5}, {128, 129}, {73, 68}, {127, 130}, {126, 131}, {103, 97}, {125, 124}, {39, 44}, {96, 95}, {63, 62}, {72, 70}, {101, 77}, {100, 78}. There are also two cells with three members: {80, 71, 69} and {79, 76, 75}.

It would be possible to reduce the size of the appendix by giving for each (m,n) one solution from each cell of the partition $\mathcal{P}(m,n)$ rather than one solution from each isometry equivalence class. But when two solutions differ by the flip of a foursome, it is not clear which is most useful to see, so we have not done this.

2 Lower bounds on queen domination numbers

We begin by showing what happens when the board is far from square.

Proposition 1 *If $n \geq 3m-2$, then $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = m$.*

Proof. Each queen attacks all squares in her own row, but at most three squares in any other row. Thus $m-1$ queens occupy at most $m-1$ rows and cover at most $3(m-1)$ squares in any row that does not contain a queen. On the other hand, m queens are certainly sufficient. □

We note that $\gamma(Q_{3\times 6}) = 2$ and $\gamma(Q_{5\times 12}) = 4$, but as shown by our computations, for $m = 4, 6, 7$, $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ reaches m before n reaches $3m-2$.

Raghavan and Venketesan [17] and Spencer [5, 20] independently proved that

$$\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rceil. \tag{1}$$

It has been shown [8] that $\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) = (n-1)/2$ only for $n = 3, 11$. Both of these values are significant for our work here, as we now discuss.

A central queen on $Q_{3\times 3}$ shows $\gamma(Q_{3\times 3}) = 1$. This simple fact has a useful generalization: if C is a central sub-board of $Q_{m\times n}$ such that every square of $Q_{m\times n}$ has a line meeting C, then a subset of C that occupies all those lines is a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$. More than a hundred years ago, Ahrens [1] gave dominating sets of this type for $Q_{13\times 13}$ and $Q_{17\times 17}$, which were later shown to be minimum. We found that $Q_{13\times 16}$ has a minimum dominating set (solution #23 in the database) of this *centrally strong* form and have also used this idea to produce good upper bounds of $Q_{m\times n}$ for some m, n, as shown below.

It follows from [21] that there are exactly two minimum dominating sets for $Q_{11\times 11}$. Placing the origin of our coordinate system at board center, these sets are $D = \{(0,0), \pm(2,4), \pm(4,-2)\}$ and the reflection of D across the column $x = 0$. So up to equivalence D is the unique minimum dominating set of $Q_{11\times 11}$, consisting of a foursome and a queen at its center. This amazing set has an influence on many other values of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$.

First, since D fits on $Q_{9\times 9}$, by omitting edge rows and columns of $Q_{11\times 11}$ we get dominating sets of $Q_{m\times n}$ for $(m,n) = (10,11), (10,10), (9,11), (9,10), (9,9)$, and these turn out to be minimum dominating sets. In a sense, the observed failure of monotonicity, $\gamma(Q_{8\times 11}) = 6 > 5 = \gamma(Q_{9\times 11})$, occurs simply because D does not fit on $Q_{8\times 11}$.

Also, by adding edge rows or columns to $Q_{11\times 11}$ and adding corner squares to D, we obtain dominating sets which turn out to give $\gamma(Q_{11\times 12}) = 6$, $\gamma(Q_{11\times 13}) = 7$, $\gamma(Q_{12\times 12}) = 6$, $\gamma(Q_{12\times 13}) = 7$, $\gamma(Q_{12\times 14}) = 8$, $\gamma(Q_{13\times 13}) = 7$, $\gamma(Q_{13\times 14}) = 8$, $\gamma(Q_{14\times 14}) = 8$, and $\gamma(Q_{15\times 15}) = 9$. Finally, it is shown in [22] that D gives a set implying $\gamma(Q_{53\times 53}) = 27$.

It was observed by Eisenstein et al. [6] that if a dominating set D of $Q_{n\times n}$ contains no edge squares, the facts that there are $4(n-1)$ edge squares and every queen covers eight edge squares imply $|D| \geq \lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil$. This suggests the bound (1).

A similar approach leads one to guess the bound of our next theorem, but some care is needed to handle the general case.

Theorem 2 *Let m, n be positive integers with $m \leq n$. Then*

$$\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \geq \min\left\{ m, \left\lceil \frac{m+n-2}{4} \right\rceil \right\}. \tag{2}$$

Proof. It suffices to show that if $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \leq m-1$ then $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \geq (m+n-2)/4$. So we assume that $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \leq m-1$.

First, suppose $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = m-1$. Then by Proposition 1 we have $n < 3m-2$, which implies $m-1 > (m+n-2)/4$ as needed.

Thus we may take $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \leq m-2$ and let D be a minimum dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$. Since $m \leq n$, there are at least two rows and at least two columns that do not contain squares of D. Let a be the number of the leftmost empty column, b the number of the rightmost empty column, c the number of the lowest empty row, d the number of the highest empty row. The board has a rectangular sub-board U with corner squares $(a,c),(a,d),(b,c)$, and (b,d). Let E be the set of edge squares of this sub-board. Then $|E| = 2(d-c)+2(b-a)$.

Removing columns a and b and rows c and d divides the board into nine regions (some possibly empty). Let C be the set of squares of D inside U; that is, $C = \{(x,y) \in D : a < x < b \text{ and } c < y < d\}$. Let T_{nw} be the set of squares of D in the "northwest" region of the $m \times n$ board; that is, $T_{nw} = \{(x,y) \in D : x < a \text{ and } y > d\}$. Similarly we label seven more subsets of D by their "geographic direction" from the central region: $T_n, T_{ne}, T_e, T_{se}, T_s, T_{sw}$, and T_w. Let $R = T_{nw} \cup T_{ne} \cup T_{sw} \cup T_{se}$, the set of those squares of D whose orthogonals do not meet U. Let $S = T_n \cup T_e \cup T_s \cup T_w$, the set of those squares of D having exactly one orthogonal that meets U. Then D is the disjoint union of R, S, and C.

Since each column to the left of column a contains at least one square of D,

$$|T_{sw}| + |T_w| + |T_{nw}| \geq a-1. \tag{3}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} |T_{se}| + |T_e| + |T_{ne}| &\geq n-b, & (4)\\ |T_{sw}| + |T_s| + |T_{se}| &\geq c-1, & (5)\\ |T_{nw}| + |T_n| + |T_{ne}| &\geq m-d. & (6) \end{aligned}$$

Adding inequalities (3)-(6) and using the definitions of R and S gives

$$2|R| + |S| \geq m+n-2-(d-c)-(b-a). \tag{7}$$

Each square in R covers at most two squares of E, as the square's orthogonals and one of its diagonals miss E. Each square in S covers at most six squares of E, as one of the square's orthogonals misses E. Each square in C covers eight squares of E. Since D is a dominating set, D covers all squares of E, so

$$2|R| + 6|S| + 8|C| \geq 2(d-c)+2(b-a). \tag{8}$$

Adding two times (7) to (8) gives

$$6|R| + 8|S| + 8|C| \geq 2(m+n-2). \tag{9}$$

Since $|D| = |R| + |S| + |C|$, adding $2|R|$ to both sides of (9) gives

$$8|D| \geq 2(m + n - 2 + |R|).$$

Thus

$$\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = |D| \geq (m + n - 2 + |R|)/4, \tag{10}$$

which implies the desired conclusion. □

A diagram illustrating the proof for $Q_{10\times 17}$ is given here.



Figure 2. Illustration of Theorem 2's proof with $Q_{10\times 17}$

There are 120 pairs (m, n) satisfying $4 \leq m \leq n \leq 18$. Of these, the bound (2) is achieved for 40 pairs (28 with $m \leq 6$), for 76 pairs the bound is exceeded by one and for the pairs $(12, 14), (13, 17), (14, 16)$, and $(15, 15)$ the bound is exceeded by two.

Our next two results extend the ideas of Theorem 2, requiring the following terms. For a set D of squares of $Q_{m\times n}$ with $m \leq n$ and $|D| \leq m - 2$, the sub-board U defined in the proof of Theorem 2 is the *box* of D, and the set E defined there is the *box border* of D.

We explore when $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = (m + n - 2)/4$. From Proposition 1 it follows that for any positive integer m, if $n = 3m + 2$ then $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = m$, and here $m = (m + n - 2)/4$. So we restrict to $n < 3m + 2$.

Corollary 3 *Suppose $m \le n < 3m+2$ and $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = (m+n-2)/4$. Let D be a minimum dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$. Then $|D| \le m-2$, each box border square is covered exactly once by D, and D is independent.*

Proof. From $n < 3m+2$ we have $|D| = (m+n-2)/4 \le m-2$, so the box of D is defined. Since $|D| = (m+n-2)/4$, the inequalities in the proof of Theorem 2 must here be equations, so each square of the box border E is covered exactly once by D. Thus any line meeting E contains at most one square of D. Every square of D must be diagonally adjacent to four squares of E, so if any line containing a square of D does not meet E, it is an orthogonal. From (10) we see that here the set R of "corner squares" in D is empty, so every square of D has at least one orthogonal meeting E; then since (3)–(6) are equations here, each orthogonal that misses E contains exactly one square of D. Thus D is independent. □

Rarely does a minimum dominating set cover each of its box border squares uniquely; we note that the minimum dominating sets #1-4 for $Q_{11\times 12}$ have this property. Each of these sets consists of a foursome centered at $(13/2, 13/2)$ plus the corner squares $(1,1)$ and $(12,1)$, so is not independent.

As mentioned earlier, $\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) = (n-1)/2$ is achieved only for $n = 3, 11$. Considering Corollary 3, we suspect that the answer to the following question is no.

Question 2 *Does $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) = (m+n-2)/4$ with $m \le n < 3m+2$ occur, other than for $(m,n) = (3,3)$ and $(11,11)$?*

We next extend the method of proof used in [5, 17, 20] for the lower bound (1) to show that the dimensions of the box of D give a lower bound for $|D|$.

Proposition 4 *Let $m \le n$ and let D be a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$ of size at most $m-2$. Let m' be the number of rows and n' the number of columns of the box of D. Then:*

If $m' > n'$ then $|D| \ge \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$;

If $m' \le n'$ then $|D| \ge \left\lceil \frac{n-1-(n'-m')}{2} \right\rceil$.

Proof. Let a, b, c, d be defined as in the proof of Theorem 2. (Then $m' = d-c+1$ and $n' = b-a+1$.) Since $m' \le m \le n$, we may choose an integer e such that e through $e+m'-2$ are numbers of columns of the board. Set $S = \{(x,c), (x,d) : e \le x \le e+m'-2\}$ and $P = \{(x,y) \in D : x < e \text{ or } x > e+m'-2\}$. Then no square is diagonally adjacent to more than two squares of S and no square of P is orthogonally adjacent to any square of S. As the $2(m'-1)$ squares of S are covered by D, $2(m'-1) \le 2|P| + 4(|D| - |P|)$, which implies

$$|D| \ge \left\lceil \frac{m'-1+|P|}{2} \right\rceil . \tag{11}$$

If $m' > n'$ then we can choose e so that all columns that do not meet S are occupied, so $|P| \geq n - (m' - 1)$. If $m' \leq n'$ we can choose e so that S is contained in the top and bottom edges of U, and then $|P| \geq n - n'$. In both cases, (11) implies the conclusion. □

As $\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) = (n-1)/2$ only for $n = 3, 11$, we have $\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$ for all other positive integers n. There is much evidence that this lower bound is quite good. Work from [2, 4, 10, 13, 16, 20, 21] reported in [16] shows that for n from 1 to 120, excluding 3 and 11, we have $\lceil n/2 \rceil \leq \gamma(Q_{n\times n}) \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1$. In this range, $\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ is known for 46 values of n and $\gamma(Q_{n\times n}) = \lceil n/2 \rceil + 1$ is known for $n = 8, 14, 15, 16$. Also, $\gamma(Q_{(4k+1)\times(4k+1)}) = 2k + 1$ is known for $1 \leq k \leq 32$.

For $m < n$, we have little evidence that the bound (2) is good. We were not able to use the methods of the proofs of Theorem 2 and Proposition 4 to improve on this bound. Also, a computer search using a greedy algorithm for some larger m, n did not supply evidence about lower bounds for $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$.

The statement of Proposition 4 leads one to consider the quantity $n/2$. We have checked that when $4 \leq m \leq n \leq 18$, $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \geq \min\{m-1, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1\}$. This bound and the bound (2) are close only when m and n are close. So we ask the following.

Question 3 *For m, n with $m \leq n$, what is a good general lower bound for $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$? In particular, is it true that $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \geq \min\{m-1, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1\}$?*

3 Construction of dominating sets

Given dimensions m and n, we would like a general approach that would allow us to construct minimum dominating sets of $Q_{m\times n}$, or at least reasonably small dominating sets. We have two difficulties to consider.

The first difficulty was just discussed: in general we know the value of $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ only approximately.

The second difficulty is that construction of a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$ generally means specifying most or all of the lines that the set is to occupy. There are some restrictions that the numbers of the lines must satisfy, as we now describe.

Let $D = \{(x_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq l\}$ be a set of l squares of $Q_{m\times n}$ that occupies difference diagonals $(d_i)_{i=1}^l$ and sum diagonals $(s_i)_{i=1}^l$. Since the square (x,y) is on the difference diagonal with number $y - x$ and the sum diagonal with number $y + x$, summing over D gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} d_i = \sum_{i=1}^{l} y_i - \sum_{i=1}^{l} x_i \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{l} s_i = \sum_{i=1}^{l} y_i + \sum_{i=1}^{l} x_i. \tag{12}$$

The Parallelogram Law $2x^2 + 2y^2 = (y - x)^2 + (y + x)^2$ gives a quadratic constraint

$$2\sum_{i=1}^{l} x_i^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^{l} y_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{l} d_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{l} s_i^2 \tag{13}$$

on the line numbers.

In each of the two constructions given below, we will refer to lines that must be occupied for domination as *required* lines and other lines as *auxiliary* lines.

Both constructions produce a number of minimum dominating sets, but neither can produce a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$ of size less than $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. This is a little evidence for the possible bound mentioned in Question 3.

3.1 Domination by 0-covers

This idea generalizes [22, Section 2]. Let D be a set of squares of $Q_{m\times n}$. If it is possible to place the origin of the coordinate system so that every even column and every even row contains a square of D, we will say D is an *orthodox* set. That is, an orthodox set is one that occupies at least every other column and every other row of $Q_{m\times n}$.

Say that square (x,y) of $Q_{m\times n}$ is *even* if $x + y$ is even, *odd* if $x + y$ is odd. We divide the even squares of $Q_{m\times n}$ into two classes: (x,y) is *even-even* if both x and y are even, *odd-odd* if both are odd. If D is an orthodox set and each odd-odd square of $Q_{m\times n}$ shares a diagonal with some square of D, we say D is a 0-*cover*. For example, solution #10 for $Q_{7\times 11}$ given in Table 1 is a 0-cover; take the origin at $(6, 3)$ to see this.

It is clear from the definition that a 0-cover dominates every even square of $Q_{m\times n}$, and since every odd square of $Q_{m\times n}$ is on one even-numbered orthogonal, all odd squares are also dominated: a 0-cover is a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$. Many 0-covers appear in the appendix, and are labeled there as such.

Since $Q_{m\times n}$ has at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ even-numbered columns, an orthodox set on $Q_{m\times n}$ has at least $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ members. Generally, we expect that most of the squares of D will be even-even, to help dominate the odd-odd squares diagonally. When n is considerably larger than m, there are more possibilities of placing queens on odd squares that occupy even columns. Also, it is possible sometimes to achieve a dominating set of size less than $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ by a minor modification, as is shown in solution #1 for $Q_{7\times 12}$ in Table 1. If the center of the square there labeled $(6, 3)$ is taken to be the origin of the coordinate system, the dominating set shown misses being an orthodox set only by not occupying the rightmost column. Thus the three odd-odd squares in that column are not covered along their column, as they would be by an orthodox set. But the queen on a dark square covers those three squares, and the odd squares of its column, and thus completes a dominating set of size 5.

Minimum dominating set #147 for $Q_{12\times16}$ is a 0-cover with a single queen on a dark square, at $(6,10)$. The squares covered only by this queen are the dark squares in its column and $(1,10)$. Replacing $(6,10)$ with the white square $(6,5)$ covers those squares and also the square $(1,0)$. In fact, the full set now covers all of row 0 and is thus a minimum dominating set of $Q_{13\times16}$; it is solution #15 for $Q_{13\times16}$, rotated by 180 degrees.

There are many ways to create 0-covers, and we will only give one example. An approach is to regard $Q_{m\times n}$ as the union of overlapping copies of $Q_{m\times m}$; for odd m, this allows us to use [22, Theorem 1], which gives necessary and sufficient conditions for an orthodox set on $Q_{m\times m}$ to be a 0-cover.

Example 1 *A 0-cover implying* $\gamma(Q_{13\times19}) \leq 10$.
We take the origin of the coordinate system to be the center of $Q_{13\times19}$*, and regard* $Q_{13\times19}$ *as the union of two copies of* $Q_{13\times13}$*, centered at* $(\pm3,0)$*. From [22, Theorem 1], if we regard the center of* $Q_{13\times13}$ *as the origin, an orthodox set on* $Q_{13\times13}$ *dominates if the set occupies the sum and difference diagonals with numbers in* $\{-6,-2,0,2,6\}$*. Asking this on both copies of* $Q_{13\times13}$*, we wish to have our orthodox set occupy the sum and difference diagonals with numbers in* $\{-6,-2,0,2,6\} \pm 3$*, which is* $\{\pm1,\pm3,\pm5,\pm9\}$*, so there will be two auxiliary difference diagonal numbers* d_1, d_2 *and two auxiliary sum diagonal numbers* s_1, s_2*. The required column numbers are* $\pm1,\pm3,\pm5,\pm7,\pm9$*, so there will be no auxiliary column numbers. The required row numbers are* $0,\pm2,\pm4,\pm6$*, so there will be three auxiliary row numbers* r_1, r_2, r_3*.*

From (12) we have $d_1+d_2 = r_1+r_2+r_3 = s_1+s_2$ *and (13) gives* $d_1^2+d_2^2+s_1^2+s_2^2 = 420+2(r_1^2+r_2^2+r_3^2)$*. We first attempt to find a solution with symmetry by a half-turn about the board center: this means* $r_1 = 0, r_2 = -r_3, d_1 = -d_2$*, and* $s_1 = -s_2$*. Then the quadratic constraint simplifies to* $d_1^2+s_1^2 = 210+2r_2^2$*, of which one solution is* $d_1 = 13, s_1 = 7, r_2 = 2$*. Now all lines are specified, and it is not difficult to find the solution* $D = \{\pm(9,0),\pm(7,-6),\pm(5,2),\pm(3,2),\pm(1,-4)\}$*.*

3.2 Domination by centrally strong sets

We begin by considering a board C which is to be a central sub-board of a larger board B. Say that C has m_1 rows and n_1 columns, with $m_1 \geq n_1$ and m_1, n_1 not both even. It is convenient here to have the board squares of side length two, and place C with its center at the origin. Thus if, for example, m_1 is odd and n_1 is even, then each square has center (x,y) with x an odd integer and y an even one.

We then wish to choose a nonnegative integer k and a set D of squares of B (actually, all or almost all in C) such that D contains at least one square from the extension of each orthogonal of C to B, and D contains exactly one square from the extension of each difference diagonal of C, except none from the highest k and the lowest k extended

difference diagonals; similarly for sum diagonals. Let

$$m = m_1 + 2n_1 - 2k, \qquad n = 2m_1 + n_1 - 2k, \qquad g = m_1 + n_1 - 2k - 1. \tag{14}$$

Then $m \le n$, and it is straightforward to verify that if C is taken to be the central $m_1 \times n_1$ sub-board of the $m \times n$ board B, then D is a dominating set of $Q_{m\times n}$ and $|D| = g$. Such a D will be called a *centrally strong* set, as it generalizes the idea discussed for square boards in [22, page 234]. We note that our definition requires each square of D to have both diagonals among the required ones, and thus both have numbers of absolute value at most $m_1 + n_1 - 2k - 2$, but this does not imply $D \subseteq C$. If in fact $D \subseteq C$, we say that D is a *strict* centrally strong set.

A number of strict centrally strong sets occur in the appendix, and are labeled there as such. We note that these sets can only occur when $m \le n < 2m$; this follows from (14) and the fact that since there will be $n_1 - 2k - 1$ auxiliary row numbers, this quantity is nonnegative.

One merit of this construction is that a single centrally strong D gives an upper bound for $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ for several pairs (m, n) since D is confined to a small central region of the $m \times n$ board, especially if D is strict. For example, there is a strict centrally strong set $D = \{\pm(-5, 0), \pm(-3, 4), \pm(-1, 6), \pm(1, 2), \pm(3, 6)\}$ with $m_1 = 9, n_1 = 6$, and $k = 2$, and $|D| = 10$, which shows that $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \le 10$ when $9 \le m \le 17$ and $6 \le n \le 20$. For some of these pairs (m, n), this bound is poor, but for the six pairs with $m + n \ge 35$, combining with the bound (2) gives $9 \le \gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \le 10$, and 10 is a useful upper bound for some of the smaller boards also.

The simplest centrally strong sets occur with $m_1 \ge 1$, $n_1 = 1$ and $k = 0$, where we get m_1 queens occupying all squares of the $m_1 \times 1$ board C, and the following bound (which we have stated in terms of $m = m_1 + 2$). For $3 \le m \le 10$ at least, this bound gives the exact value of $\gamma(Q_{m\times(2m-3)})$.

Proposition 5 *For $m \ge 3$, $\gamma(Q_{m\times(2m-3)}) \le m - 2$.*

We next consider the effect of (12) and (13) on the search for centrally strong sets. Symmetry and the requirement that each difference diagonal contains exactly one square of D imply that the sum of the difference diagonal numbers of D is zero. Similarly the sum of the sum diagonal numbers of D is zero, and then (12) implies that $\sum_{(x,y)\in D} x = 0$ and $\sum_{(x,y)\in D} y = 0$. As we require a centrally strong set to occupy all (extended) columns of the sub-board, we regard the n_1 numbers of these columns as required column numbers; by symmetry their sum is zero. As C has n_1 columns and g occupied squares, there will be $g - n_1 = m_1 - 2k - 1$ auxiliary column numbers, each having parity opposite to that of n_1. Since $\sum_{(x,y)\in D} x = 0$ and all required column numbers sum to zero, so do the auxiliary column numbers. Similarly there will be m_1 required row numbers and $g - m_1 = n_1 - 2k - 1$ auxiliary row numbers, with sum zero, each having parity opposite

to that of m_1. If D is strict, then all numbers of occupied columns have absolute value at most $n_1 - 1$ and all numbers of occupied rows have absolute value at most $m_1 - 1$. (We have required that m_1, n_1 not both be even because if they were, there would be an odd number of auxiliary row numbers, each odd, so their sum could not be even, thus not zero.)

Using the identities $\sum_{i=1}^{j}(2i-1)^2 = \binom{2j+1}{3}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{j}(2i)^2 = \binom{2j+2}{3}$, we see that the sum of the squares of the numbers of all occupied diagonals of C is $4\binom{g+1}{3}$, the sum of the squares of the required column numbers is $2\binom{n_1+1}{3}$ and the sum of the squares of the required row numbers is $2\binom{m_1+1}{3}$. Letting $\sum_{orth}$ denote the sum of the squares of the auxiliary column numbers and auxiliary row numbers, the quadratic constraint (13) gives

$$\sum_{orth} = 2\left[\binom{g+1}{3} - \binom{m_1+1}{3} - \binom{n_1+1}{3}\right]. \tag{15}$$

Combined with Proposition 5, part (a) of the following proposition shows how small a centrally strong set can be. In parts (b) and (c), we limit the values of m_1, n_1, k that need be considered when constructing centrally strong sets.

We say that a value of k for which there exists a centrally strong set on $Q_{m_1 \times n_1}$ is *feasible* for (m_1, n_1).

Proposition 6 *(a) For any centrally strong set D with $n_1 > 1$, $|D| \geq n/2$.*
(b) For any (m_1, n_1), it is only necessary to use the largest feasible k to determine all upper bounds for $\gamma(Q_{m\times n})$ implied by centrally strong sets from (m_1, n_1).
(c) If k is feasible for (m_1, n_1) and $k+1$ is feasible for (m_1, n_1+2), the latter gives the more useful result.

Proof. (a): As the number $n_1 - 2k - 1$ of auxiliary row numbers is nonnegative, $n_1 \geq 2k+1$. If $n_1 = 2k+1$ then $g = m_1$ by (14), and then the fact that the right side of (15) is nonnegative implies $n_1 = 1$ and $k = 0$, the situation of Proposition 5. Thus for $k \geq 1$ we have $n_1 \geq 2k+2$, which by (14) is equivalent to $|D| \geq n/2$.

(b): Suppose for some integer $h > 0$ that both k and $k-h$ are feasible for (m_1, n_1). Then the triple m_1, n_1, k gives a dominating set D of size g on $Q_{m\times n}$, where m, n, g are determined by (14), and similarly the triple $m_1, n_1, k-h$ gives a dominating set D' of size $g+2h$ on $Q_{(m+2h)\times(n+2h)}$. However, by repeating $2h$ times the process of adding an edge row, edge column, and corner square, we can construct from D a dominating set of $Q_{(m+2h)\times(n+2h)}$ of the same size as D'.

(c): Using (14), if m_1, n_1, k gives a dominating set of size g for $Q_{m\times n}$, then $m_1, n_1 + 2, k+1$ gives a dominating set of size g for $Q_{(m+2)\times n}$. □

Example 2 *A centrally strong set implying* $\gamma(Q_{13\times 16}) \le 8$.

Let $m_1 = 7$ *and* $n_1 = 4$, *and* $k = 1$. *Then a strict centrally strong set* D *is to have one auxiliary row number, which from* $\sum_{(x,y)\in D} y = 0$ *must be zero, and two auxiliary column numbers, say* c_1, c_2, *each in* $\{-3,-1,1,3\}$. *From* $\sum_{(x,y)\in D} x = 0$ *we see* $c_2 = -c_1$ *and from (15) we have* $c_1^2 + c_2^2 = 18$, *so we can take* $c_1 = 3$ *and* $c_2 = -3$. *We then easily obtain* $D = \{\pm(1,-6), \pm(3,4), \pm(3,0), \pm(3,-2)\}$; *see solution #23 for* $Q_{13\times 16}$. *(Recall that board squares have edge length two, column numbers are even integers, and row numbers are odd integers here.) Using (14) this gives* $\gamma(Q_{13\times 16}) \le 8$ *(and equality holds by our computer search).*

We give two infinite families of strict centrally strong sets, each including a minimum dominating set found by Ahrens [1].

Example 3 *Strict centrally strong sets for* $n_1 = 5, k = 1$ *and odd* $m_1 \ge 5$, *and for* $n_1 = 7, k = 2$ *and odd* $m_1 \ge 7$.

In our approach described above, all orthogonal numbers would be even here; we have divided by two, thus returning to a board with squares of edge length one.

For $n_1 = 5, k = 1$, *and* $m_1 \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, D *consists of* $\pm(-1, \frac{m_1-1}{2})$, $(0,0)$, *and* $\pm(0,2i)$ *and* $\pm(2, \frac{m_1+5}{2} - 4i)$ *for* $1 \le i \le \frac{m_1-1}{4}$. *With* $m_1 = 5$, *this gives a minimum dominating set of* $Q_{13\times 13}$ *found by Ahrens [1]; see also solution #41.*

For $n_1 = 5, k = 1$, *and* $m_1 \equiv -1 \pmod 4$, D *consists of* $\pm(\pm 1, \frac{m_1-1}{2})$, $\pm(-1, \frac{m_1-3}{2})$, $(0,0)$, $\pm(0,2i)$ *for* $1 \le i \le \frac{m_1-7}{4}$, *and* $\pm(2, \frac{m_1+3}{2} - 4i)$ *for* $1 \le i \le \frac{m_1-3}{4}$.

These sets show that for $i \ge 3$, *if* $2i - 1 \le m \le 2i + 7$ *and* $5 \le n \le 4i + 1$, *then* $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \le 2i + 1$.

Now let $n_1 = 7$.

For $m_1 = 7$, *let* $D = \{i(1,2) + j(2,-1) : -1 \le i, j \le 1\}$. *This gives a minimum dominating set of* $Q_{17\times 17}$ *found by Ahrens [1]; see also solution #21.*

For $m_1 = 9$, *let* $D = \{(0,0), \pm(1,4), \pm(2,-3), \pm(1,2) + j(2,-1) : -1 \le j \le 1\}$. *This gives* $\gamma(Q_{19\times 21}) \le 11$, *which is the best we know.*

The following complicated description of a placement is the result of unifying four cases depending on the residue of m_1 *modulo 8. Any odd* $m_1 \ge 11$ *has a unique expression* $m_1 = 11 + 2(l_1 + l_2)$ *with* l_1 *an integer and either* $l_2 = l_1$ *or* $l_2 = l_1 + 1$. *(Here* $l_1 = \lfloor (m_1 - 11)/4 \rfloor$ *and* $l_2 = \lceil (m_1 - 11)/4 \rceil$.*)*

Start with $(0,0), \pm(1,2), \pm(2,-3), \pm(3,-1), \pm((-1)^{l_1}, -2l_1 - 5), \pm((-1)^{l_2+1}, -2l_2 - 4)$. *Add* $\pm(2, 4j)$ *and* $\pm(2, 4j+1)$ *for* $1 \le j \le \lceil l_2/2 \rceil$, *and add* $\pm(2, -4j-2)$ *and* $\pm(2, -4j-3)$ *for* $1 \le j \le \lfloor l_2/2 \rfloor$. *If* $l_2 = l_1$ *then add* $\pm(2, (-1)^{l_1}(2l_1 + 4))$.

These sets show that for $i \geq 4$, if $2i - 1 \leq m \leq 2i + 9$ and $7 \leq n \leq 4i + 1$, then $\gamma(Q_{m\times n}) \leq 2i + 1$.

In both of our constructions above, once a set of lines to be occupied by the dominating set is specified, it is necessary to see whether one can find such a dominating set. A fast backtrack search idea of Hitotumatu and Noshita [11], explained and amplified by Knuth [14], was used by Östergård and Weakley [16] to find values and bounds of $\gamma(Q_{n\times n})$ up to $n = 120$. This approach and also the algorithm of Neuhaus [15] can be applied to rectangular boards as well. But as mentioned, neither of our constructions can produce a dominating set of size less than $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ for $Q_{m\times n}$ (with $m \leq n$). Thus a resolution of Question 3 would be needed to determine whether extensive search based on these constructions is useful.

The complexity of computing minimum dominating set of queens is another open question [7, Section 5]. Backtracking algorithms, dynamic programming, and treewidth technique are analyzed extensively by Fernau [7, Sections 2-4].

Acknowledgements

Research of the first author was supported in part by OTKA grant K 111797. Part of the computations were carried out on NIIF Supercomputer based in Hungary at NIIF National Information Infrastructure Development Institute.

References

[1] W. Ahrens, *Mathematische Unterhaltungen und Spiele* (B.G. Teubner, Leipzig-Berlin, 1910).

[2] A.P. Burger and C.M. Mynhardt, Symmetry and domination in queens graphs, *Bulletin of the Institute of Combinatorics and its Applications* **29**(2000), 11–24.

[3] A.P. Burger and C.M. Mynhardt, Properties of dominating sets of the queen's graph Q_{4k+3}, *Utilitas Mathematica* **57**(2000), 237–253.

[4] A.P. Burger, C.M. Mynhardt, and E.J. Cockayne, Domination numbers for the queen's graph, *Bulletin of the Institute of Combinatorics and its Applications* **10**(1994), 73–82.

[5] E.J. Cockayne, Chessboard domination problems, *Discrete Mathematics* **86**(1990), 13–20.

[6] M. Eisenstein, C. Grinstead, B. Hahne, and D. van Stone, The queen domination problem, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-third Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing, *Congressus Numerantium* **91**(1992), 189–193.

[7] H. Fernau, Minimum dominating set of queens: A trivial programming exercise?, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **158**(2010), 308–318

[8] D. Finozhenok and W.D. Weakley, An improved lower bound for domination numbers of the queen's graph, *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* **37**(2007), 295–300.

[9] C. Grinstead, B. Hahne, and D. van Stone, On The Queen Domination Problem, *Discrete Mathematics* **86**(1990) 21-26.

[10] P.B. Gibbons and J. Webb, Some new results for the queens domination problem, *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* **15**(1997), 145–160.

[11] H. Hitotumatu and K. Noshita, A technique for implementing backtrack algorithms and its application, *Information Processing Letters* **8**(1979), 174–175.

[12] C.F. de Jaenisch, *Traité des Applications de l'Analyse Mathématique au Jeu des Échecs*, Appendix, pages 244 ff (Imperial St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 1862).

[13] M.D. Kearse and P.B. Gibbons, Computational methods and new results for chessboard problems, *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* **23**(2001), 253–284.

[14] D.E. Knuth, Dancing links, in: *Millennial Perspectives in Computer Science*, J. Davies, B. Roscoe, and J. Woodcock (Editors), 187–214 (Palgrave, Houndmills, 2000).

[15] S. Neuhaus, Eigenschaften kleinster dominierender Mengen und Dominanzzahlen von Damengraphen, *Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Cologne* (2009).

[16] P.R.J. Östergård and W.D. Weakley, Values of Domination Numbers of the Queen's Graph, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **8**(2001), no. 1, Research Paper 29, 19 pp. (electronic).

[17] V. Raghavan and S.M. Venketesan, On bounds for a covering problem, *Information Processing Letters* **25**(1987), 281-284.

[18] W.W. Rouse Ball, *Mathematical Recreations & Essays, 3rd Edition* (revision by H.S.M. Coxeter of the original 1892 edition), Chapter 6, Minimum pieces problem (Macmillan, London, 1939).

[19] J.J. Watkins, *Across the Board: The Mathematics of Chessboard Problems*, Chapter 8 (Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2004).

[20] W.D. Weakley, Domination in the queen's graph, in: *Graph Theory, Combinatorics, and Algorithms, Vol. 2 (Kalamazoo, MI 1992)*, Y. Alavi and A. Schwenk (Editors), 1223–1232 (Wiley, New York, 1995).

[21] W.D. Weakley, A lower bound for domination numbers of the queen's graph, *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing* **43**(2002), 231-254.

[22] W.D. Weakley, Upper bounds for domination numbers of the queen's graph, *Discrete Mathematics* **242**(2002), no. 1-3, 229-243.